

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/749,299	COLGROVE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenneth M. Lo	2188	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Pending

 (1) Kenneth M. Lo.

(3) _____.

 (2) Robert C. Kowert (Reg #39255).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 August 2007
Time: 8:45-9:45am
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Rejection to Claims 1, 13, 14, 19, 21 and 32

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 13, 14, 19, 21 and 32

Prior art documents discussed:

See Continuation Sheet
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed:

Kishi (United States Patent 6,029,179) Thomas et al. (United States Patent 6,061,692)..

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner's proposed amendments to Claims 1, 14, 19, 21, 32 and cancelation of Claim 13.

Examiner reasserted rejections under the prior art continued to read upon Applicant's amended claims filed 7/10/2007. Examiner proposed the cancelation of Claim 13 as being overly broad in regards to other claims, and suggested adding a limitation to the other discussed claims which would distinguish Applicant's invention from the prior art of record. Applicant agreed to have Claims 1, 14, 19, 21, 32 amended to include the limitation "but is readable" after "store data that is not modifiable", detailed in Examiner's Amendment..